

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 15 and 16 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 6, 11 and 12 being the independent claims. Claims 2, 7, 13 and 14 were previously canceled. Independent claims 1, 6, 11, and 12 have been amended to clarify the subject matter claimed. Support for these amendments can be found at FIGs. 2 and 3, and paragraphs 0039 and 0044 of the Specification, among other locations. In addition, claims 1, 5, 6, 10-12, and 15 have been amended to address the objections of the Examiner. These changes introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections under MPEP 2111.04

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 5, 6, 10-12, and 15 because of what the Examiner believes to be informalities in the claim language. While the Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's assessment, these claims have been amended in order to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicants respectfully request that the objections be reconsidered and withdrawn in view of these amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claim 1, arguing that this claim is obvious over U.S. Patent 6,438,123 ("Chapman") in view of U.S. Patent 6,510,162 ("Fijolek"). In particular, the Examiner contends that it is inherent that data transmitted from a cable modem termination system (CMTS) to a server contains a unique address for the server. While this may or may not be true, it is not inherent that such an address for the server is appended to a modified packet by a cable modem, as recited in claim 1. Neither reference discloses or suggests this feature. Fijolek discloses a network including a plurality of cable modems, CMTSs, and a server (FIG. 1 and col. 12, ln. 10-26), but does not disclose or suggest a cable modem that applies an address of a server to a modified packet. Nor is this feature disclosed or suggested by Chapman. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not obvious over the applied art.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the RTP header is suppressed. This feature is not disclosed or suggested by the applied art. Chapman discloses suppression of IP and UDP headers (col. 4, ln. 29-32) and compression of an RTP header (col. 6, ln. 20-45), and goes on to distinguish compression from suppression of a header (col. 6, ln. 20). Chapman does not disclose or suggest suppression of an RTP header, however. Nor is suppression of an RTP header disclosed or suggested by Fijolek. For at least this reason as well, claim 1 as amended is not obvious over the applied art.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 3-5 as being obvious over Chapman in view of Fijolek. These claims depend from claim 1 as amended and include all features thereof. As discussed above, claim 1 as amended includes features that are

neither disclosed nor suggested by Chapman or Fijolek. These features are necessarily included in each of claims 3-5. For at least this reason, none of claims 3-5 is obvious over the applied art.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 6, arguing that this claim is obvious over Chapman in view of Fijolek. Claim 6 has been amended to recite that the address of the headend server is appended to the data packets by the cable modem. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, this feature is not disclosed or suggested by either reference. For at least this reason, claim 6 as amended is not obvious over the applied art.

In addition, claim 6 has been amended to recite that the headend server comprises logic to restore a previously suppressed RTP header. Suppression of an RTP header is not disclosed or suggested by the applied art. Nor is the restoration of such a suppressed header disclosed or suggested. For at least this reason as well, claim 6 as amended is not obvious over the Chapman or Fijolek references, whether considered alone or together.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 8-10, all of which depend from claim 6 as amended and necessarily include all features thereof. As discussed above, claim 6 as amended includes features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Chapman or Fijolek. These features are necessarily included in each of claims 8-10. For at least this reason, none of claims 8-10 are obvious over the applied art.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 11, arguing that this claim is obvious over Chapman in view of Fijolek. Claim 11 recites that the cable modem comprises logic to append the address of a headend server to modified data packets. As

discussed above, the appending of such an address to data packets by a cable modem is not disclosed or suggested by either reference. For at least this reason, claim 11 is not obvious over the applied art.

In addition, this claim has been amended to recite that the cable modem comprises logic to suppress an RTP header. As discussed above, suppression of an RTP header is not disclosed or suggested by Chapman or Fijolek. For this reason as well, claim 11 as amended is not obvious over the applied art.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 12 as obvious over Chapman in view of Fijolek. This claim includes the step of appending a hardware address of a headend server to modified data packets, as performed in a cable modem. As discussed above, this step is not disclosed or suggested by either Chapman or Fijolek. For at least this reason, claim 12 is not obvious over these references.

In addition, claim 12 has been amended to include the suppression of an RTP header. As discussed above, the suppression of such a header is not disclosed or suggested by either Chapman or Fijolek. For at least this reason as well, claim 12 as amended is not obvious over the applied art.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 15 and 16 as being obvious over Chapman in view of Fijolek. These claims depend from claim 12 as amended and therefore include all features thereof. Given that the applied art does not disclose or suggest all features of claim 12, the applied art likewise does not disclose or suggest all features of either claim 15 or 16. For at least this reason, claims 15 and 16 are not obvious over the applied art.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection of the pending claims have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections, rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: May 7, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

672933_1.DOC